

Application No. 10/560,525
Amendment dated March 21, 2011
Reply to Office Action of September 21, 2010

REMARKS

**Reconsideration And Allowance
Are Respectfully Requested.**

Claims 31, 32, 34, 36-39, 41-45 and 51 are currently pending. Claims 1-29, 46-48 and 50 have been canceled. Claims 34, 41, 43, 44 and 51 have been amended. Claims 30, 33, 35, 40 and 49 have been withdrawn. No new matter has been added. No new claims have been added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Office Action first objects to claims 43 and 44 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of the claim from which it depends. These claims have been amended to depend from independent claim 51 and the objection is believed to be overcome.

Claims 31, 32, 34, 36-39, 41, 42, 45 and 51 stand objected to based upon informalities. These claims have been amended and the objection is believed to be overcome.

On February 1, 2011, an Interview was conducted between Applicants' representative, Howard Flaxman, and Examiner Cazan. During the course of the Interview, the cited references were discussed as they relate to the pending claims. Applicants' representative expressed the view that the proposed modification of U.S. Patent No. 5,609,284 to Kondratenko ("Kondratenko") in view of U.S. Patents Nos. 6,207,221 and 6,638,592 (Schulz-

Application No. 10/560,525

Amendment dated March 21, 2011

Reply to Office Action of September 21, 2010

Harder '221 and Schulz-Harder '592) is not in fact obvious. Applicants' representative and Examiner Cazan also discussed the possibility of filing a Declaration concerning the obviousness of the proposed combination. The Examiner stated such a Declaration would be considered.

With regard to the rejections based upon cited references, claims 31, 32, 34, 36-39, 42, 45 and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Kondratenko, Schulz-Harder '221 and Schulz-Harder '592. Claim 41 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondratenko, Schulz-Harder '221, Schulz-Harder '592 and in view of Applicants' admitted prior art. These rejections are respectfully traversed in view of the preceding amendments and the remarks which follow.

With regard to the outstanding rejections, the Office Action admits the failure of Kondratenko to disclose the application of Kondratenko's technique to a ceramic layer having a thickness between 0.1 and 3.0 mm and to which a metallization forming a plurality of individual metal areas has been applied on at least one surface. The Office Action further admits that Kondratenko fails to disclose such structure wherein individual metal areas are at least a distance from one another and the separating or break-off line is produced between the metal areas so as to separate the substrate into multiple substrates, the metal areas having a thickness between 0.02 and 0.6 mm, the metal areas being a distance between 0.1 and 3.0 mm

Application No. 10/560,525

Amendment dated March 21, 2011

Reply to Office Action of September 21, 2010

from each other and the metal areas being at a distance 0.05-1.5 mm from a respective break-off line between the metal areas.

The Office Action attempts to remedy these deficiencies with the citation of Schulz-Harder '221 and Schulz-Harder '592. However, both Schulz-Harder '221 and Schulz-Harder '592 were invented by one of the inventors of the present application. With this in mind, Applicants' representative has consulted with Jurgen Schulz-Harder, inventor of both Schulz-Harder '221 and Schulz-Harder '592, regarding the obviousness being asserted in the Office Action. The attached Declaration explains why the proposed modification would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. The Examiner's attention is specifically directed to Paragraph 8 of the Declaration which explains the importance of the claimed features in the present application and why one would not take the teachings of Schulz-Harder '221 and Schulz-Harder '592 and apply them to Kondratenko in showing the obviousness of the claimed invention.

With the foregoing in mind, it is Applicants' opinion the proposed modification of Kondratenko as suggested by the Examiner is improper and Applicants respectfully request all rejections based thereon be withdrawn. Applicants, therefore, believe the present application is now in condition for allowance and Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/560,525
Amendment dated March 21, 2011
Reply to Office Action of September 21, 2010

It is believed that this case is in condition for allowance and reconsideration thereof and early issuance is respectfully requested. If it is felt that an interview would expedite prosecution of this application, please do not hesitate to contact Applicants' representative at the below number.

Respectfully submitted,



Stewart L. Gitler
Registration No. 31,256

WELSH FLAXMAN & GITLER LLC
2000 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 920-1122